

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

SONIA RUSSELL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOUGLAS A. TURINO, Acting
Postmaster General,

Defendant.

8:23-CV-256

ORDER

The Court entered a final judgment in this case on May 13, 2025. Filing 8. Specifically, the Court found that the plaintiff's claim was untimely, and dismissed her complaint. Filing 7; filing 8.

The plaintiff has filed a "Motion for Extension to Respond to Memorandum and Order" (filing 9) asserting that on May 13, "the Court issued a Memorandum and Order requiring Plaintiff to respond by June 12, 2025," and asking for an extension of that deadline. Except that's not true—the Court dismissed the plaintiff's claim entirely, and did not ask for a response. There is no response deadline to extend.

But that's not all—the plaintiff also filed a "Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss." Filing 10. That doesn't make sense either, because the Court dismissed this case on initial review and the defendant neither appeared nor filed a motion to dismiss. *See* filing 5; filing 7.

In other words, the only thing left for the plaintiff to do in this case is appeal.¹ The deadline for filing a notice of appeal—as the plaintiff was advised,

¹ The Court also considered whether the plaintiff's motion could be construed as a motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59 or Fed. R. Civ. P. 60. But nothing in either of the plaintiff's


see filing 8-1—is July 14, 2025. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(a)(1)(B)(iii); Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(1)(C). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The plaintiff's motion to extend (filing 9) is denied.
2. The Clerk of the Court shall send the plaintiff a copy of this order and a copy of the Court's "Notice of Appeal (Civil)" form.

Dated this 13th day of June, 2025.

BY THE COURT:



John M. Gerrard
Senior United States District Judge

filings addresses the basis for the judgment against her—the timeliness of her complaint. *See* filing 9; filing 10.